

V. Answering Pro-choice Objections

By: John D. Ferrer, Last updated 13 October 2015

A. Introduction

1. This section constitutes a *negative case* against abortion in that it exposes faults and failings within abortion choice advocacy.
2. *Begging the Question*: one primary response to the pro-choice objections is that they beg the question (circular reasoning, *petitio principii*) by assuming the fetus is not a rights-bearing human life and so lacks any innate right to protected life. Consequently, other reasons help show abortion as worthwhile in some cases. But assuming it's not a rights-bearing human being is precisely the problem at issue. If it does have the right to life then these problems should be endured because of its higher value (human life).

3. Summarizing The Negative Case Against Abortion (on-Demand)	<p>P1) Abortion on demand entails egregious concessions that would be openly immoral or illegal if applied consistently throughout the world of law and ethics (including harms-benefits calculations, natural law ethics, constitutional law, civil law, bioethics, etc.). For example, abortion on demand entails unnecessary harm, oppression/discrimination, objectifying human beings, torture, dehumanization, irresponsibility, desecration, injustice, etc.</p> <p>P2) Such concessions are wrong in nature/degree and unnecessary.</p> <p>P3) Being wrong and unnecessary they should not be done.</p> <p>Concl.) Therefore, abortion on-demand should not be done.</p>	<p>a) The positive case is listed above.</p> <p>b) Argument is valid as a sorites</p> <p>c) Some of the objections that follow do not neatly fit this summary being objections and not necessarily arguments, implicit or otherwise.</p> <p>d) P1 & P2 are most subject to dispute, i.e., contesting the notion of “unnecessary” or particular “egregious concessions,” but if even some of these objections fail and the positive case above prove valid that can vindicate prolife.</p>
---	--	---

B. Scientific/Natural Status of the fetus	Objection	Answer
	1. Fetus is Non-life/Non-human/Potential Human	*Genetically/biologically it is indisputably a distinct living human organism of the species <i>homo sapien</i> from the moment of conception onward. In fetology it is normally termed a baby or human being, a boy/girl. *As a member of the human race it's literally a human being. *It is also, by legal precedent, a “child-in-utero” (terminology used in the Laci and Connor law; AKA: unborn victims of violence act 2004). *It's not a potential human, but a human with potential. *True, it is not a <i>rational</i> animal, nor is it clearly endowed with mind/will/emotion, nor with “spirit,” but neither is it necessarily the case that a human must satisfy such philosophical or theological criteria before it can shift the burden of proof onto pro-choicers who assume it ‘guilty’ until proven innocent (i.e., we can kill it unless it's proven unethical)
	2. Fetus isn't wanted/Trespasser	*Parent's duty to child is an ethical fundamental. *She entered the baby-lottery/sent out baby invitation when she had sex. *Buyer's remorse is her problem, not the child's. *She has no reason for surprise at a baby appearing in her “house” if she left the door open and invited it in. *Doesn't change child's nature.
	3. Fetus is a Parasite	*Technically false since parasites are of a different species but children in utero are of the same species. The more precise term is symbiosis. *Inverts medical practice by dehumanization and neglecting to care for humans, even though abortion is supposedly a “medical” procedure. *In a non-technical sense, all humans are parasites, so if that fact justified killing human fetuses then it works for killing toddlers. *Developmental discrimination, it's not the baby's fault. *The mother brought on pregnancy.
	4. “Unplugging the Violinist” Argument	Also called the “Good Samaritan Argument,” (Boonin) wherein agreeing to the pregnancy is a supererogatory act and not an ethical mandate. Judith Jarvis Thompson's 1971 Article, “A Defense of Abortion,” proposed that one is not obligated to comply after she is secretly attached to a world-class violinist so he can overcome his failing kidneys by sharing hers. Thus abortion is justified. *But, it's a disanalogy since the violinist argument fails to parallel the parental relation. Parents have <i>prima facie</i> obligation to their children and they to their parents. Parental abuse/child neglect laws hinge on this. *Diff. between active killing and passively permitting death, i.e., violinist dies of the kidney disease while the child dies at surgeon's hand. *Disanalogy: (1) no consent to link with the violinist whereas in sex, consent to let sperm and egg mingle is, for reasonably informed people, consent to pregnancy, (2) maternal relation is natural, violinist relation is artificial, (3) Sex <i>is</i> an entry into the baby lottery (see above) meanwhile the hypothetical victim in JJT's argument did nothing which is a lottery entry to “link with a violinist.” (4) A stronger analogy would be if the woman plugged into the machine linking her to the violinist because she received physical pleasure from it (maybe it involved a morphine shot as part of the procedure) and not intending to help the violinist; but she knew that there was a good chance that the machine rejects her. As it turns out, it didn't reject her and she is now hooked up to the violinist. In that case she has consented and JJT's example is a disanalogy.
	5. Fetus is “clump of cells”	*False, this is a functioning organism, with discrete organelle operations cooperating to sustain all the features of life for this genetically distinct individual. It is not a mere cell mass or somatic cell clump. *At conception it has all the unique features of a distinct human life (as opposed to nail clippings or a kidney). *See #1. Above—this is a human with a potential.
	6. What about “morning after” pills?	*Methods which prevent conception are contraceptives, and not abortions. But whatever kills zygote/conceptus/fertilized egg is literally an abortion, killing individual human life. *Hinges on a loose sense of “pregnancy,” instead of the clearer conception definition. *Conception can occur 3 minutes to 3 days after sex, “morning after” can be too long. *Abortifacient: Morning-After pills are designed to prevent conception, but some make fallopian tube hostile to zygote thus killing it.

B. Scientific/Natural Status of the fetus, cont.	7. In Vitro fertilization clinics destroy embryos	*But they shouldn't. *Hypocrisy among pro-lifers does nothing to excuse killing the child-in-utero. *In Vitro clinics should treat each embryo as a baby, i.e., changing policies to halt any wanton loss of life.
	8. Fetus is a Non-person (legal sense & moral sense)	*Our bias should favor life even when personhood isn't certain. *Personhood is a philosophical notion, not a biological one, and can't be solved with medical/scientific facts. *Even if one grants this precedent, via RvW, it doesn't follow that legally/morally human fetuses can be (rightfully) destroyed for convenience nor that the fetus is inconsequential/ disposable. *The fetus remains a genetically distinct organism of the species <i>homo sapien</i> properly classified as a unique human being and child-in-utero. The burden of proof is on the abortion-advocate to show that "personhood" must be added to that before it is a protected kind of human being. *Personhood isn't needed to establish the dignity and value of human life since "all men are created equal" and "men" are "equal" from creation (conception). *It's an argument from ignorance to assume that ambiguity/uncertainty about its personhood justifies abortion.
	9. "Conception" isn't specific enough/It's unclear when, in conception process, new life occurs. (D. Boonin)	*Fallacy of the beard (when does scruff become a beard? Ambiguity over details doesn't disqualify clear cases). *This blurs epistemology and metaphysics—not knowing when in conception new life occurs is no disproof <i>that</i> new life occurs at conception. *Where there's mystery, we should err on the side of life. *Every "marker" for pro-choice views on when legal personhood begins is equally or more vague. *The "moment" of conception can be admitted as vague (is it legally/medically relevant only at completion or inception? Is it the whole process or just some point in it?) yet it remains the onset of distinct human life, such that destroying the unfertilized gametes is negligible while destroying the conceptus is killing.
	10. Sperm & Egg are alive→pro-lifers should treat them as equally protected	*This is biologically confused. They aren't <i>homo sapiens</i> , nor living human organisms. They're haploid gametes with half the genetic identity of the individual, and lacking biological features of life: digestion, excretion, cellular division. *Human beings have the capacity for multicellular stages of development, but a sperm and egg, as such, do not. They must become a different entity (a zygote) before they have that capacity. *They fit only some stream-lined definitions of life (same as viruses) they do not fit other more robust definitions of life. *They are part of a human, not a whole human. *The sperm and egg, separately, lack the capacity to develop as a self-directed genetically distinct human being. *Neither constitutes a stage of development for the individual human being. *The zygote is a stage of a distinct human life, the egg and sperm are not. *The zygote is a distinct organism, whereas the sperm and egg are gametes functioning as part of the reproductive system of a parent organism. *Haploid vs. Diploid: The sperm and egg are haploid—having genetic identity with the donor male or female respectively. Yet the zygote is diploid having the mingled genetics of both the male and female sources. *Innate capacity for distinct life: the zygote has the full and natural capacity to develop into another human being. The sperm or egg have no such capacity, by themselves. They would need fringe/cutting edge science, dabbling in ethically questionable realms, to generate new life (a clone).
	11. Burning Research Lab argument (E. Goodman)	*Non-sequitur: it does not follow that saving the full-grown human over the dozens of embryos in vials is proof that the embryos aren't human. *Disanalogy: the debate is not about saving humans from an accidental fire, it's over whether it's ethical to <i>intentionally kill</i> humans. The burning lab illustrates a true dilemma but abortions are not a dilemma context where one <i>must</i> have a human killed. *Human beings can be equally deserving of life, yet <i>relatively</i> valued (i.e., loving your kids over another's)
	12. Twinning (since the conceptus can twin, it is not a single human life)	*Non-sequitur: it doesn't follow that a thing that becomes 2 humans was not human beforehand. *By analogy, a flatworm becomes 2 flatworms if cut in 2, but that's no disproof of the original flatworm. *This raises a question over when soul infuses the body (religious anthropology), but not even that view is required for religious views (see, Traducianism—soul and body could both be produced by parents)
	13. Acorn Argument	Also in Judith Jarvis Thomson's "A Defense of Abortion" (1971), this argues that an acorn isn't an oak tree, hence destroying an acorn is not ethically comparable to destroying an oak tree. Likewise, killing the child in utero isn't unethical like it would be to kill a toddler. *Disanalogy: (1) Oak trees can reproduce sexually or asexually, hence the seed is not necessary to the furtherance of the species of Oak Trees. (2) Oak Trees are substantially less valuable than humans, this much is recognized by countless laws and legal precedents—only in some cases would "murdering" an oak tree be problematic; whereas murdering a human being is always problematic. (3) Oak Trees reproduce through hundreds and thousands of acorns (and acorns are more akin to the zygote than to gametes) with most of these being eaten, washed away, crushed, dried out, or relying on external features if it is to "implant" and have a chance to grow. (4) One can grant that killing an acorn is killing an early stage oak tree without that changing anything. Since each oak tree can reproduce itself ten-thousand times over, a loss of one dumb/non-conscious oak tree is natural, normal, common, and ethically uninteresting. (5) Human rights have a hard-fought history against which "Oaken rights" can't compare. (6) Oak tree reproduction, overall, is too disparate to serve as a useful parallel to human reproduction. For example, "enslaving" a tree is no crime since that does not devalue the tree as it would if it were a person enslaved.
	14. Cloning (all our cells are potential people; since it's ridiculous to protect all our skin cells abortion can be justified)	*Natural vs. Artificial means—one must discredit natural law ethics for these 2 modes of generating life to be treated as equals. Yet our legal history pays great deference to natural law ethics wherein certain rightful states, such as motherhood, procreation, etc. are endowed with natural duties "having skin" does not entail a duty to preserve and protect all one's skin cells. *Appealing to cloning complicates the

		matter since cloning is also ethically controversial. You wouldn't want to prop your car up on a broken jack; nor would you want to prop your ethical argument up with another questionable line of ethics.
C. Rights of the Mother	1. Bodily Sovereignty-- Mother has Bodily sovereignty incl. right to terminate pregnancy.	*Practical limits: my right to swing fist ends at your nose. *There are bodily duties to which we are bound (i.e., legal/work contracts, family law) which limit how we can rightly handle our own bodies—sovereignty has legal and contractual limits. This can parallel natural law if the sex act is a submission to a natural “contract” entailing certain subsequent behaviors. *Our bodies aren't entirely ours. We've bodily-duties to God, family, and others. *Human beings aren't objects to be owned like disposable property. *Location doesn't make possession. If I swallowed your ring, it's still yours. *Conceptus isn't mother's body since (a) mother and child are interchangeably separable (mom may live and baby die, baby live and mother die), (b) conceptus is attacked by mother's immune system, (c) it's genetically distinct from mother, (d) it's a biologically distinct and separate organism.
	2. Right to privacy	*Private evil is still evil. *Offset by public duty. *Child's right to privacy. *Privacy is less important life. *The Roe V. Wade case, identified the right of privacy (i.e., Griswold v. Conn.) as applying to abortion yet this ruling was based, in part, on a scientifically confused view of the fetus as a “potential human.” This basis is factually wrong. The child is already a human being. As such, the “right of privacy” doesn't clearly apply if RvW had admitted, what scientists knew at the time. The child would thus have a potential (or actual) claim to a right of life and privacy. *Abortion interferes in the child's privacy.
	3. Childbirth is a choice	*But motherhood is a duty once a woman becomes a mother. And from conception to birth, she is a mother-with-child. We would not excuse fathers of fatherly duty just because they want to dissociate from the child. *Actions have consequences, and sex is an entry into the baby lottery. Morality requires we face natural consequences of our actions, especially if we'd otherwise hurt/kill others.
	4. What about rape & incest?	*“How should civilized society treat human beings who remind us painful events?” [Klusendorf]. *It's unjust to punish someone for the crimes of another, yet the child is innocent. *Abortion adds trauma. *It doesn't unrape anyone. *Abortion displaces guilt (the state of guilt) treating the child as if it's guilty and deserving punishment when it is the rapist who should be punished. *Abortion adds injustice to injustice. *We should prefer to suffer evil than generate more of it. *Abortion accommodates the rapist by silencing the key witness, hiding the event and its consequences, and by destroying evidence. *New life can be redemptive. *Celebrate the life but not the act. *Many rape victims don't terminate the pregnancy, though the way it's told one can hardly imagine how a sane person would do so. *This is a small percentage of abortion cases, and exceptions should not make the rule.
	5. Pro-life merges church & state	*Immoral is still immoral. *Religious people are also citizens, and can act, speak, and advocate as citizens in a “secular” way. Likewise, non-theists can advocate religiously or adhere to non-theism religiously. *Church is a corrective against immorality in society (see abortion). *Pro-life position is not uniquely religious. *Church and state <i>are</i> interactive and can serve each other well so long as they don't try to replace or displace each other (i.e., utopianism).
	6. Abortion-choice needed for equality w/ men.	*This says men and women are not naturally equal, but need access to a surgical procedure to be equal in their human rights. *Equality is not “imparted” to women by Gov't, they have equality already whether Gov't recognizes it or not (i.e., “created equal”). *Discriminates by standardizing customarily masculine approach to sex over and above a typically feminine approach. *Many woman consciously prefer and advocate for pro-life as the morally superior position which better aligns with femininity, equality, and human dignity.—i.e., it is more womanly to embrace motherhood, use one's body to care for others, foster life, etc. than to militate against these uses for one's self-interests. *Motherhood exalts women since it is the more uniquely feminine privilege, not abortion. Men could mimic abortion procedures but not pregnancy. *Men can't have abortions, why should women be able to—that's “unequal” and “discriminates against men. *Pro-choice harms women since at least half of aborted fetuses are female; abortion mothers are the “second victim,” and abortion, as an unnatural action, can be very traumatizing in a way that is more morally charged than the potential trauma of dangerous pregnancies.
	7. Pro-life Discriminates Against Women	
	8. Consent to Sex Isn't Consent to Pregnancy	*All active agents involved consented (except in cases of rape). *Biological Consent--pregnancy & sex are biologically interwoven, so it would be like eating a pound of cake but not consenting to the weight gain—the eating <i>is</i> the consent. *They consented to the causes of pregnancy. *Acts of consent can betray one's words or intentions. *Since men consent to fatherhood by having sex, equal rights suggest women consent to motherhood by having sex. *This argument would absolve dead-beat dads of any responsibility (which is immoral). *Motherhood as a duty to one's child trumps consent.
	9. Abortion is self- defense [Non-mortal threat] (Eileen McDonagh, <i>Breaking the Abortion Deadlock</i> , '96)	*Disanalogy: (1) the child isn't an intruder, it is where it's supposed to be at that stage of development. (2) Neither is the child a parasite (see above), (3) Nor an aggressor. (4) The mother stands to benefit from pregnancy at least as much as she stands to lose—that would be an odd attacker who benefits his victim. (5) The mother's body is designed and equipped for pregnancy, its natural, but McDonagh treats the relation like it's unnatural and strange. (6) Pregnancy isn't immoral nor criminal like theft or assault. (7) Pregnant women can operate just fine at work and at home; so characterizing it as an ‘attack’ is a stretch. *If pregnancy is such a handicap, as McDonagh suggests, then nature has made mothers unequal to man—denying rightful equality. *Consent can/does include accidents and unforeseen consequences; consent allows for accidents that were foreseeable as possible outcomes. If you consent to sex, you

			accept the possible consequence of a sexually transmitted disease, falling in love, or getting pregnant. You still have to pay for the window if you consented to playing baseball but not to breaking your neighbor's window (see Klusendorf, 192). "You only consent to what is within your control" (Ibid.). *Sex is the material cause of pregnancy; the woman is the efficient/agent cause—not a 2 nd or 3 rd party as her arg. seems to suggest. The child didn't cause its own existence. The sexually active mother is the one who caused her pregnancy, hence she is the culpable party not the victim. *If she doesn't want an intruder she shouldn't materialize one, becoming it's mother, by her willful and informed actions. *Passive abstention ≠ active killing—its fine to refrain from donating blood, but it's not fine to slit someone's throat for needing your blood donation. *It's illegal to take certain drugs (thalidomide, or Accutane—with restrictions) for medical benefits which also cause birth defects in the child—yet that contradicts her "bodily autonomy." *Moral obligations can trump consent.
D. Health/Medical	1. Abortion is Self-defense [Mortal Threat].		*Yes, if tubal pregnancy, etc. No, if it's a normal/non-mortally dangerous pregnancy. *Life over limb. *Pregnancy/baby isn't a disease or crime/criminal * Only if imminent mortal danger since that pits life against life, and one death can prevent two deaths.
	2. What about Ectopic Pregnancy/Mortal threat to mother?		*[see above] Abort. is non-obligated option as self-defense. *If dilemma is "mom & baby die" vs. "baby dies," then 1 death is better than 2. *Justified not as abortion but a dilemma-charged rescue effort for the mother's life. *The abortion is still regrettable since that child's life should otherwise have been saved.
	3. What about if the child is handicapped?		*Discrimination. Handicapped humans are just as human, having the same equality under the law. *Discrimination of human/legal status on the basis of ability is evil. *Misdiagnosis is a real possibility.
	4. It's established law, so deal with it.		*Non-sequitur: legal≠moral. *Laws can change. *Abortion was legalized in the 1st place against prior "established law"; by this standard abortion wouldn't have been legalized. *Slavery was law for longer.
	5. "Coat-hanger" argument (see "international objection" below)		One of the most prominent arguments in the pro-choice repertoire is that laws against abortion do not stop abortion but instead drive women to illegal and unsafe means of abortion, i.e., "back-alley" abortions. However, *The numbers don't compare, (millions babies vs. dozens mothers) *CDC stats: 411 women died from legal abortion between 1973-2009, but even that number may be suppressed and biased (David Reardon, "The Cover-Up: Why U.S. Abortion Mortality Statistics Are Meaningless" 3 June 2000). The estimated "10's of thousands" of back-alley abortion deaths are baseless/unverified. *Illegal or "unsafe" abortion is equally good evidence that abortion itself is wrong—killing humans is bad, risking another life in the process is worse. Women aren't forced to have illegal abortions. *It's not clear that women would pursue illegal abortion in any great numbers if abortion were banned. *Non-sequitur: just because some women will pursue back-alley abortions does not make abortion ethical or deserving of legalization. *Of course the law can't stop all abortions, so long as it stops many abortions or contributes to a culture of greater responsibility and less death it can be worthwhile. *Legalizing abortion skyrocketed the abortions from about 90,000 to roughly 1 million yearly. *Abortion was a relatively safe procedure by 1957 (260 died in the U.S.). 24 died in 1972 from legal abortions and 39 from illegal abortions. *84-90% of abortions in 1958 were performed by licensed medical professionals (Calderone 1960). *Legalization may have heightened maternal deaths since public opinion about abortion and extra-marital pregnancy shifted, since 1973, toward more unplanned pregnancies as women still pursued abortions by legal and illegal means (Kermit Gosnell).
	6. Doctors, not governments, should make medical recommendations		*Abortion isn't a medical issue since it deals in suffering and death instead of health and life. *Everyone should have a moral interest working to promote human rights whether gov't, doctors, or individuals. *Gov't is a proper domain for (1) laws about social ethics and societal epidemics and for (2) protecting basic human rights. *This argument would also oppose the Affordable Care Act and its contraceptive mandates (w/ abortifacients). [I.e., "Get out of my womb" means don't have employers be forced by government to have a financial say in one's private bedroom and medical decisions].
	7. Adoption is more traumatic than abortion		*Not likely, since the trauma of death is uncalculable. * Plus abortion victims widely report trauma. The pregnant mother has an ordeal either way, but at least she can go without the guilt of a felt sense of murder. *The right thing is often painful. *Theoretically possible, but can't be known—one can't abort & orphan same child to compare them.
E. Social/Societal	1. Men should stay out of it, it's a woman's issue		*Human rights are an everybody issue. *Boyfriends, Dads, Hubby's, & Docs are all affected by it. *That child is half his. *This objection discourages compassion and moral legislation (i.e., all legislation should be morally guided/morally correct). *Men should care if evil is being done. *It is broadly unethical to let people harm themselves or others. *Abortion was legalized by a court of 9 white male justices, so men started it. *Treated as a "women's issue" this ignores the heavy influence of men on abortion (http://www.theunchoice.com/coerced.htm#5 ; http://www.deveber.org/text/chapters/Chap16.pdf).
	2. Stillbirth/Miscarriages	(1) They're common	*Common does not equal good. *We should redeem the parts of nature we can, including advancing medical technology and awareness to reduce miscarriages. *Miscarriage are ethically distinct from abortion just as dying of natural causes is different from killing someone for being in your way.
		(2) God aborts babies	*Maybe not. It could be that nature aborts babies since nature is fallen. *Even if God did this, God can do things righteously that we cannot. God has a right to reclaim lives he's given. *Miscarriage seems to be a product of the Fall (Gen 3) and not part of God's ideal.

E. Social,	3. Adoption nowadays is a poor option	*Even if this were true it's still secondary. Adoption policies should be reformed, just as abortion should be banned. *Unethical is still unethical. *An orphan's hard life is better than killing children.
	4. No one would want to adopt a child of a rapist	*False, there are many pro-life groups that could and would arrange for an adoption of a rape-baby if given the chance. *Adoption agencies aren't allowed to disclose the details of the mother/father.
	5. Abortion eases family/social burdens	*Utilitarian Fallacy. *Some burdens should be carried: military service, parenthood, etc. taxes. *More babies equal bigger families—greater social support system over time. *Babies are also a blessing.
E. Social/Societal, cont.	6. Helps solve teen pregnancy	*Utilitarian Fallacy—killing children is still evil, regardless of results. *This is better addressed in other ways such as abstinence, safe sex, stronger families, family values, stronger faith communities, etc. and these don't involve killing children. *Keeping abortion legal implicitly affirms sex outside of marriage since the consequences of sex are legally separated from the act of sex.
	7. Abortion helps bring equality for women [compared to men]	*Twisted "equality." The most unique distinguishing ability of women (motherhood) shouldn't be attacked. *Equality needn't be in every/most sense to be true in the relevant sense. *Women treat sex differently, equalizing them harms uniqueness of their sexual nature—i.e., separating sex from marriage, commitment, & procreation. *Sex-selective abortion hurts women (i.e., girl babies aborted more often).
	8. Abortion brings economic gains	*Utilitarian Fallacy—there are other ways to achieve this without killing. *This unethically objectifies human life. *Unethical to create incentives for killing humans. *Broadly unethical to profit off of killing. *Some burdens should be dutifully carried: military service, parenthood, etc. taxes. *More babies equal great workforce, long term economic benefit. *Babies are also a blessing. *Countries with high birth rates and high poverty tend to have many causes of poverty—government corruption, civil strife, war, terrorism, plague, tribalism, etc. *Birth rates correlate with poverty but are known to "self-correct", without legalizing abortion, so long as the economies improve.
	9. Abortion curtails overpopulation	*Utilitarian fallacy. *Increased affluence does same thing for birthrate. *Food production/infrastructure adjusts according to need. There's no known upper limit to these. *Overpopulation's mostly myth (http://www.realclearscience.com/articles/2011/07/20/the_world_is_not_overpopulated_106247.html).
	10. Mother'd be rejected by friends/family	*Killing a human being is still worse. *There are other social support networks (churches, community centers, counseling, etc.). *Get new friends. *Family are legally obligated to care for minor children.
	11. Pro-lifers force their beliefs on others	*Abortion <i>always</i> forces one's views on another (i.e., killing the child). *Mistakes subjective opinion for objective fact. If abortion is wrong, then we all should adjust to the fact. *Fails by analogy: abolitionists are forcing their abolition on slave owners/suffragists are forcing their voting rights on anti-suffragists. *Abortion is a public matter where other human beings are involved.
	12. Pro-lifers are too "single-issue"	*Red herring: one can admit this, and abortion still be evil deserving prohibition. *Abortion itself is a multi-faceted issue: abuse, family, health, jobs, economy, etc. *Fails by analogy with slavery (i.e., "abolitionists in 1860 were too 'single issue'"). Yet abortion is far worse (>0.5mill vs. 57mill). *Too impractical. Widely dividing one's interests (financially) would ruin the effort. The pro-life cause is already underfunded compare to the pro-choice side, since it's more profitable to kill babies at a price than the raise them at an expense. *Pro-lifers can still contribute responsibly towards adoption, pro-family groups, sex-education, and crisis counseling while focusing their main sights on abortion.
	13. International Objection (see, "coat-hanger" objection above).	It is true that some international settings show that banning abortion generates dangerous/illegal abortions. *However, legalizing abortion still increases the death rate since lots more babies die even if (supposedly) fewer mothers die. *Family law, rape laws, and patriarchalism may also need to change/evolve to support a higher ethical ideal of banning abortion. In those cases, pro-life ideals need to be phrased with respect to the particular causes for unplanned pregnancy (such as sex-slavery, forced marriages, and rape) as well as addressing the need for alternatives to abortion. *Western libertarian views of sex might be too much for traditional 3 rd world countries to handle.
	14. Appearance/Mother didn't want to get fat	[I know someone who claimed this reason, but I would not imagine a pro-choice <i>advocate</i> would say this.] *Trivial/superficial/selfish reasoning. *It's evil to grade appearances over human life.
F. Judicial/Legislative	1. If we banned abortion mothers and doctors would be put on trial.	*False, the law doesn't work retroactively; they acted legally at the time. *Irrelevant, it's still unethical even if the consequences are odd/difficult to accept. *For many of them, that sense of justice might be more refreshing and "right" than getting off scot free from the known immorality of killing children. *Even before abortion was legal, the mothers are the "second victim" and are rarely/mildly punished.
	2. Abortion can be done with good intentions	*It's still malicious against the baby and mother, despite good intentions (http://www.frc.org/content/how-abortion-harms-womens-health) *Abortion isn't clearly "better" than birthing a child. *So what? The road to hell is paved with good intentions. *Intentions aren't enough, good actions are still required.
	3. Hypocritical to affirm Pro-life & death penalty	*Preborns aren't criminals so abortion is injustice to preborns. *Red herring/Distraction. *One can be inconsistent on death penalty and still right on abortion. *These are separable.
	4. It's legal so it's moral.	*Legal doesn't equal moral. *Society/Majority/Courts can be wrong (i.e., slavery) *Roe v Wade might not be rightfully legal but an abuse of judicial power, grossly immoral, or conducted errantly.

F. Judicial/Legislative, cont.	5. Abortion is common in international law and in other countries.	*Ad populum/consensus gentium—majority and popularity don't make a thing good. *Many other countries have an ethically and legally inferior socio-cultural system such that we would be worse if we adopted their respective policies for ourselves. **"Civilized" (1 st world) countries may legalize abortion hypocritically, in a way that betrays their otherwise "high" view of human life. Again, that sets a bad standard for us to follow. *Since fetuses are humans then they are potential victims of "crimes against humanity," and "human rights violations," and that identifies evil at a transcultural level—violating a human being's innate rights, regardless of federal or state law. *the scale of human deaths involved in the abortion trade make it the most deadly action man has ever committed against fellow human beings. That would seem to qualify abortion as, at least a candidate, for the claim "crime against humanity" and that would trump other federal, state, or international permissions.
	6. Abortion was legal until the 19 th century—antiabortionism is a modern backlash	*False. This point mistakes a spike in legal bans on abortion for the first/only bans on abortion. Wherever abortion was explicitly addressed, it was overwhelmingly taboo and/or illegal. *The historical norm was to prohibit abortion in keeping with the best medical knowledge of the time. As knowledge advanced, the terms of the ban advanced; hence there was a spike in anti-abortion laws when modern embryology began to overturn the medieval/ancient view (i.e., life begins at the quickening). *The Hippocratic Oath demonstrates an ancient anti-abortion standard (5 th -3 rd cent.). *Abortion is condemned/taboo in other ancient sources: <i>Sibylline Oracles</i> (6 th BC), <i>Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides</i> (50BC-50AD), <i>1st Enoch</i> (1-2 cent BC), Josephus (1 st cent. AD). *In the medieval era, Christian, Jewish and Muslim standards agreed on the quickening view. *The quickening view was standardized in British Common law, and was adopted into U.S. law. Ex., James Wilson makes this point clear in "Of the Natural Rights of Individuals," (1790-1792). *Equivocation. An explicit legal ban can clarify what was already prohibited previously. *Argument from silence—lack of explicit bans, naming abortion, do not constitute proof that murdering preborns was legal. *According to the prior "quickening" view, "abortion" prior to that point was not an abortion. Abortion prior to quickening wasn't known to be abortion, hence it satisfies a pro-life norm given the science of the time. *In late 19 th century medical science was advancing in its understanding of genetics and embryology—this made "abortion" a moving target, difficult to pin down since later medical standards were liable to import new facts and data.
G. Religious, cont.	1. Islam allows abortion	*Not quite. Islamic scholars disagree. Shari'ah law was crafted before modern fetology/genetics showed that the human being begins at conception. It said life began at Quickening (w/ movement, the classical view), hence it wouldn't be "abortion" before that point. Islamic scholars can now identify start of life at conception. **The Shari'ah allows abortion only when doctors declare with reasonable certainty that the continuation of pregnancy will endanger the woman's life." ("Abortion," by Dr. Ibrahim B. Syed, Louisville, KY: Islamic Research Foundationa Intl. Inc., N.D. (<2012), para. 10), accessed 29 March 2013 at: http://www.irfi.org/articles/articles_101_150/abortion.htm . *Even if, conception view were disputed, and dualistic view retained (i.e., it's human life only when soul infuses body), abortion would still be prohibited since Islam only allows abortion before that point (before 5 mo. or the quickening).
	2. Jews, Liberal Christians, "Black" Church, and other often affirms abortion	* Only hypocritically so, and not for theological reasons so much politically liberal affiliations (Black churches and Western Jews are overwhelmingly Democrat/Liberal leaning). *Religion need not antagonize science and science identifies human life as beginning at conception, thus any Biblical and natural law injunction against abortion would apply from conception onward (see, Gen 9:6; Ex. 20:13).
	3. Wicca, Unit./Univ., & other non-biblical relig's often support abortion.	* Freedom of religion undermines any distinctly religious justifications for abortion insofar as they are offered as legal cause to "keep it legal." * Natural law, history, and modern science serve very well in the case against abortion. *Whole groups can be wrong: this is a Consensus Gentium/Ad Populum Fallacy if these are given as direct proof that abortion is permissible. *Religions can be wrong.
	4. Separation of Church and State: Banning abortion favors Christianity	*It cuts both ways: some religions/denominations affirm abortion-choice. *Falsely assumes there aren't secular reasons to reject abortion. *Religions can be right for religious or non-religious reasons (i.e., a religion may teach that we should wash our hands as that is ceremonially pure, but it's also hygienic). *Bans on abortion are historically cross-cultural, spanning many different religions—Jainism, Baha'i, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, spanning BC and AD eras.
	5. God kills people anyway, so abortion is "being Godly."	*Disanalogy: we can't take life just because God does; He first gave life so it's his to reclaim, not ours to steal. *Miscarriages are natural evils, not moral evils. It's not clear that God <i>does</i> these but rather that God allows these as part of nature since the Fall. *OT War contexts are disanalogous since abortion isn't a war context. *Capital punishment is for the guilty, not for the innocent (babies). *Corporate guilt is God's to dole out, not for us. It's prohibited for us (Jer 31:29-32; Eze 18:1-13). *God's good intentions, good outcomes, good manner, and good nature spell a different moral justification than when humans try to execute justice. He can administer fierce justice with divine exactitude while we cannot.
	6. Biblically, human life begins when it first breaths (<i>nephesh</i> --soul)	*This applies to the first human life (Adam), not necessarily to subsequent human life. *Etymological Fallacy—assumes a word's origins/history dictates its current meaning. **"Soul" does not typically mean "breath," though there's a natural reason for associating the two—biological breathing things are alive. *Substance dualism could still apply without interpreting "soul" as "breath," i.e., soul could be the animating feature, the 'form,' the life itself, the seat of experience/self-awareness, the spirit, etc.

	7. Bible is silent on abortion.	*If true, then it's a fallacious argument from silence. *If false, and Bible supported abortion—that would only make it “okay” on a religious or perhaps antiquated basis, and an inconsistent one at that. *If false, and Bible condemns abortion implicitly or explicitly, then that adds religious and historical weight to the already consistent historical case against abortion. *Until recent times abortion was crude, dangerous to the mother, and inconsistent. Historically, abortion was aberrant so prohibiting it on top of the laws and moors opposing it would have been superfluous. *More importantly, this is just false. Scripture has plenty to say in favor of children, not sacrificing them for our convenience, the important of advanced planning, the sanctity of human life and not shedding innocent blood (see Biblical case above).
H. Philosophical	1. “Human being” is too imprecise/can’t be defined	*False, there are countless medical and biological textbooks which acknowledge a medically and legally sufficient sense of “human being” which includes every stage of development from germinal stage to geriatric stage, from conception to extinction. *Peter Singer, “It is impossible to give ‘human being’ a precise meaning. We can use it as equivalent to ‘member of the species of <i>Homo Sapiens</i> .’ Whether a being is a member of a given species is something that can be determined scientifically, by an examination of the nature of the chromosomes in the cells of living organisms. In this sense, there is no doubt that from the first moments of its existence an embryo conceived from human sperm and egg is a human being.” (<i>Practical Ethics</i> , 2d ed. [Cambridge: Cambridge, 1993], 85-6.
	3. Slippery Slope (if they ban abortion then what's next? Forced Marriage? Banning Contraception?	*Fear-Baiting/Politispeak *Burden of proof is on the pro-choicer to establish a principled case for why those other things would follow if abortion were banned. *Non-sequitur: wanting babies to live ≠ wanting to control women's bodies/relationships/sex-lives. *Slippery Slope Fallacy—just because one can imagine fearful outcomes sequentially does not amount to causal relation or a proof. *There's no “party line” in the pro-life movement identifying anti-abortion with anti-contraception. *Contraceptives that cause abortion would still be opposed either way.
	4. Difference between causing someone's neediness vs. causing their existence and neediness results (Boonin, 133ff).	According to David Boonin, maternal duties shouldn't be wielded with too much legal force since mothers may cause the existence of the fetus but that doesn't equate to causing their neediness as such. *Distinction without a difference. In this case, the relevant cause is still her agency and it's not clear or indisputable that her relation to the child is merely a supererogatory sustenance, as opposed to dutiful care. She caused another human being to exist in an imperiled position, and it would not have been so without her knowing activity. Hence she's still morally culpable. *Patrick Lee rebuts that if you drive a motorboat near the pier and knock three people into the water you are still responsible for helping them, even if you only caused their submersion not their inability to swim and impending fate (“A Christian Philosopher's View of Recent Directions in the Abortion Debate,” <i>Christian Bioethics</i> 10, no. 1 [April 2004], 7-31). *if the mother's milk was the only food the child could get/handle, and she was “stuck” with the born child for weeks, she would be morally responsible for feeding that child—contrary to what Boonin might say. *The mother is still a mother, with all the normal rightful freedoms and duties therein—and it seems to be her natural and normal role, as mother, to protect and care for her children (duty) however one sees fit (freedom).